

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention.

Reconsideration of the subject patent application in view of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 is amended.

Claims 1-3, 6 and 7 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shirakawa (US 2003/0117501) in view of Kawasaki et al. (US 7173665; hereinafter "Kawasaki").

Regarding claim 1, neither Shirakawa nor Kawasaki discloses, teaches or renders foreseeable a camera selecting unit that allows the user to select **both** the first camera and the second camera **at the same time**, thereby allowing the first camera and the second camera to photograph images **at the same time**. There is no disclosure in Shirakawa that any unit allows the user to select both the back camera 10a and the front camera 10b at the same time or allows the back camera 10a and the front camera 10b to photograph images at the same time. According to Shirakawa, when the user selects **one of** the back camera 10a and the front camera 10b by operating a keypad of the portable telephone, the DSP 3 may fix the selector 5 to select the user-selected one of the background image data Sa and the foreground image data Sb (Shirakawa, paragraph [0033]). This disclosure teaches away from the present invention which

allows the user to select **both** the first camera and the second camera **at the same time**.

Kawasaki does not disclose the camera selecting unit of claim 1, since the terminal disclosed Kawasaki does not have two cameras, but has only one camera 25. Thus, the combination of Shirakawa and Kawasaki does not meet all of the limitations of the claim 1, since the combined attachment would not have the camera selecting unit of claim 1. Therefore, the asserted combination of Shirakawa and Kawasaki does not render claim 1 obvious. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-3, 6 and 9-10 are dependent from claim 1 should also be allowable for at least the same reason.

Claim 7 which includes all of the limitations of claim 1 should also be allowable for at least the same reason.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Appl. No.: 10/532,399
Amdt. Dated: March 11, 2009
Reply to Office action of: December 11, 2008

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our
Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No.: NGB-38155.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 

Nobuhiko Sukenaga, Reg. No. 39446

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

DATE: March 11, 2009